

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XVII. No. 10.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 10, 1810. [Price 1s.

There is a *sinecure place*, which is, at present, held by the EARL OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE (late Lord Hobart), which place is worth £.11,094, or, in words, *eleven thousand and ninety-four pounds*, a year. The reversion of this enormous salary, that is to say, the possession of it *after the present possessor's death*, has been obtained and secured by LORD HARDWICKE, not only for himself during his life, but, beyond that, *for the lives of his two sons*; and, this Lord Hardwicke is, as the reader will recollect, a brother of Mr. CHARLES YORKE.

Mr. CHARLES YORKE, of whom the public has, within the last twelve months, heard so much; that Mr. Charles Yorke, who, upon Mr. Wardle's opening of the Charges against our late Chieftain, solemnly declared his belief that there was a Jacobinical Conspiracy on foot against the illustrious House of Brunswick; that Mr. Charles Yorke, who, from the moment the Walcheren Inquiry began, moved the Standing Order for shutting the Debate Reporters out of the Gallery; that Mr. Charles Yorke, who, when a motion was made for Inquiry, which motion was opposed by the minister, declared that he thought it his duty to stand by the minister, because the minister had resolved to stand by the king; yea, that very Mr. Charles Yorke, has, within this week, received through the hands of that same minister, a grant, for life, of a *sinecure place*, (or place where nothing is to be done) called a Tellership of the Exchequer, worth £.2,700 a year; that is to say, he has thus secured, for his whole lifetime, *two thousand seven hundred pounds a year* to be paid to him out of the taxes, raised upon the people of England.

[53] [354]

TO THE INDEPENDENT FREEHOLDERS OF THE COUNTY OF CAMBRIDGE.

Letter I.

GENTLEMEN:

Mr. Charles Yorke's having obtained a grant of a SINECURE PLACE has put it in your power to do more good, or more harm, to the cause of public liberty, than it has, for many years past, been in the power of any part of this kingdom to do, or to leave undone; and, as your conduct, upon this interesting occasion, must affect, in a greater or less degree, the whole of your countrymen, you will not, I hope, think it an act of presumption in me to state to you a few of those reasons, which, in my opinion, ought to prevent you from re-electing your late Member.

Gentlemen, it is not necessary for me to remind the far greater part of you, that his Majesty's family came not to the throne of this country in virtue of *lineal descent*; but, that they were raised to that throne by Act of Parliament, which set aside the *direct descendants*, and put his Majesty's family in their place. This the people of England did because their rights had been trampled on by the kings of the House of STUART, and because they thought, that those rights would be preserved under the House of Brunswick. But, when they made this change, they did not make it without *conditions*. An Act was passed, which is commonly called the ACT OF SETTLEMENT; but which is en-

titled "*An Act for further limiting the Crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the people.*" This Act is neither more nor less than a Statement, or rather, Declaration of the *Conditions*, upon which the House of Brunswick shall enjoy the throne of these realms; and, amongst these conditions there is this: "*That no person, who has an office or place of profit under the king, or receives a pension from the Crown, shall be capable of serving as a member of the House of Commons.*" Now, this provision having been introduced into such an Act of Parliament, an act the most important, perhaps, that ever was passed, clearly shows, how anxious our forefathers were to prevent members of parliament from being under the influence of the Crown. This provision was, however, done away by a subsequent Act of Parliament, passed at a time when the people were less alive to their interests and their honour; and, accordingly, we now see a very great abundance of *pensioners* as well as *placemen* seated in the Commons' House of Parliament; but, still, those who passed the act, by which this wholesome provision was repealed, were afraid or ashamed, to go the full length of at once opening the door to placemen and pensioners, without check or controul, and, therefore, while they permitted placemen and pensioners to be chosen members and sit in the House, they had the decency to provide, that when any man *after his election*, became a placeman or a pensioner, he should quit his seat, and should not, of course, re-enter the

M

House, unless he was re-elected by his former constituents, or by some other body of electors.

The reasoning, upon which this measure was attempted to be justified, was this; That, all that any one could ask for, on the part of the people, was, that they should *have their choice*; that, by sending the placed or pensioned man back to them, the power of rejecting him was given to them; and, that, if they re-chose him, it was clear that *they liked to have a place-man or pensioner for their representative*. How fallacious, generally speaking, was this sort of reasoning, I need hardly point out to you; for you must all recollect, that it has been offered to be proved at the bar of the House of Commons, that in the election of more than one half of the members of that House the *people* have, in fact, nothing at all to do. But, as applied to COUNTIES, and to open boroughs, like Southwark and Westminster, and some others, the reasoning is fair enough; for there, though the taxing system has created a dreadful influence in favour of placemen and pensioners, it is the fault of *the people*; it is, and must be, owing to a fault *in them*, if a person unworthy their suffrages be re-elected and sent back to parliament, and for which fault they are answerable not only to their own consciences and to their children, but to their countrymen at large; for the man they thus return has the power of assisting the making of laws to tax and to bind the whole nation, and, besides, to whatever political principles he is known to possess, they, by re-electing him, publicly and irrevocably give their sanction.

Thus, then, Gentlemen, it is now to be seen, and must, in the course of a few days, be seen, whether *you* like to have a placeman, and a *sinecure placeman* too, for your representative; and whether you are ready to give your public and irrevocable sanction to the political principles of your late member. What those principles are you know pretty well already; but, it may not be amiss, now that he is appealing to you as judges of his past conduct, to take a view of some of the prominent parts of that conduct during the last and the present session of parliament.

To name the Investigation, relative to the Conduct of the Duke of York, is to recall to your memory a crowd of circumstances that need no repeating here. Well; when that Investigation was moved for by Mr. WARDLE; when this

gentleman, to whom the nation is so much indebted, came honestly forward with *specific charges* against the Duke of York, you must remember how he was assailed by men on *both* sides of the House; but by no one was he assailed so furiously as by Mr. CHARLES YORKE, who had the confidence to ascribe Mr. Wardle's charges to the instigation of *Jacobins* and *Conspirators*. His Speech, upon that occasion, I will now insert here, because it is one of his political acts by which you ought to judge him; and upon the merits of which you have now to decide by your votes. The Speech was as follows:—

“ Mr. Yorke observed that he never listened to a charge more serious, and he had heard it with the greatest possible concern, both on account of the Commander in Chief, and the hon. gent. who had brought it forward, (hear! hear!) who took so heavy a responsibility upon himself. But he was glad that the house had come at last to some Charges against his royal highness the Commander in Chief in a tangible form. At length they could reach in a tangible shape some of those libels which had for some time past been more assiduously and pertinaciously circulated than at any former period in this country so prolific in libels. Publications which he would treat as libels, (hear! hear!) had lately appeared against the Commander in Chief, and these had been circulated with a pertinacity hitherto unexampled. He was glad therefore that something was now brought forward in a tangible form, and he hoped the House would do its duty to itself, to the country, and to the Royal House of Brunswick—(Loud cries of hear! hear!); that blame might rest where it ought to be fixed, and that if there was no ground for these accusations, justice might be done to the Commander in Chief. And he sincerely hoped, that if the latter should turn out to be the fact, the hon. gent. would be enabled to acquit himself, by shewing at least, that there existed some probable reasons in support of the heavy charge which he had taken upon himself. For my own part, Mr. Yorke continued, I believe that there exists a Conspiracy of the most atrocious and diabolical kind against his royal highness (loud cries of hear! hear!)—founded on the Jacobinical spirit which appeared at the commencement of the French revolution; for though this spirit did not shew itself

“ exactly in the same form as at first, when
 “ once raised it was not easily quelled,
 “ and it never could promote its views with
 “ better hopes of success than by talking
 “ down illustrious persons—(hear! hear!)
 “ It was the object to write down his royal
 “ highness—it was no less so to write down
 “ all the establishments of the country.
 “ By means of the press, the liberty of
 “ which was so valuable, and the licen-
 “ tiousness of which was so pernicious, it
 “ appeared to be the design of the Conspi-
 “ rators to write down the military system
 “ through the Commander in Chief—the
 “ army through its generals, and other
 “ establishments through the persons most
 “ conspicuous in each—and of this plan
 “ the present was only a particular in-
 “ stance, (hear! hear!).—He was glad
 “ that this enquiry was to take place, be-
 “ cause there was in the country a con-
 “ spiracy against all that was eminent in
 “ the state. They all knew what that spi-
 “ rit was upon which this conspiracy was
 “ founded; and though it was not the
 “ same at present as at the time of the
 “ French revolution, yet, as the late Mr.
 “ Pitt had truly said, “ the jacobinical
 “ spirit, when once roused, is not easily
 “ put down.” The spirit was not yet ex-
 “ tinct, and the consequence was a conspi-
 “ racy for talking and writing down every
 “ thing illustrious and eminent in the na-
 “ tion—to run down the royal family
 “ through the duke of York, and to run
 “ down the army through its generals.
 “ This was a consequence of a free press,
 “ the freedom of which was justly consi-
 “ dered the palladium of liberty, but whose
 “ licentiousness was the destruction of civil
 “ society. That licentiousness of the press
 “ had been actively directed against the
 “ illustrious person who was the object of
 “ this motion, and who from his station
 “ and all his past services, might be sup-
 “ posed secure from its attacks. Let
 “ blame fall where it ought; but the
 “ House ought to consider the illustrious
 “ object against whom the charge was di-
 “ rected; they ought to consider his high
 “ station in the country, and the eminent
 “ services which he had performed for the
 “ country, in the state to which he had
 “ brought the army—(hear.) What was
 “ the state of the army when he became
 “ Commander in Chief? It scarcely de-
 “ served the name of an army, and it was
 “ now found by experience to be, in pro-
 “ portion to its numbers, the best army
 “ that ever existed. The best mode to do

“ justice to the sovereign—to do justice to
 “ the high character now impeached—and
 “ to do justice to the country, would, per-
 “ haps, be to appoint a Parliamentary
 “ Commission, with power to examine
 “ each party on oath—(loud cries of hear!
 “ hear! from both sides of the House.)
 “ The gentleman might have circum-
 “ stances in view to support these charges,
 “ which he believed to be founded in
 “ truth. He only spoke of this Commis-
 “ sion with reference to his own argu-
 “ ment. He had said that he believed a
 “ Conspiracy to exist, and if the House
 “ could go along with him, and suppose
 “ that this was actually the case, he threw
 “ out for their consideration, whether a
 “ Parliamentary Commission with power
 “ to examine on oath was not preferable
 “ to a Committee. He could not think he
 “ had done his duty if he had not thrown
 “ out this idea for consideration. The
 “ importance of the subject well deserved
 “ such a mode of proceeding. But at all
 “ events, he was happy that the matter
 “ would now be properly investigated.”

Gentlemen; of all the hateful modes of
 assailing truth and justice, the most hate-
 ful assuredly is, that of raising false im-
 putations against the advocates of truth
 and justice.—Mark, now, the conduct
 of the man, whom you sent to the parlia-
 ment as your representative. He bears
 a member distinctly charge a son of the
 king with acts extremely injurious to the
 nation; and what does he thereupon say?
 Does he say, that he is ready to give the
 charge an impartial hearing; and that
 justice ought to be done upon the high as
 well as the low? Does he wait with pa-
 tience for the proofs, either of guilt or in-
 nocence? No: none of these; but, with-
 out more ado, not having boldness enough
 to *deny the charge*; not having the confi-
 dence to assert the charges, or any part
 of them, to be *false*, he endeavours to *ex-
 cite a prejudice against the charges* alto-
 gether, by ascribing them to the crafty
 wiles of *Jacobins* and *Conspirators*, who
 were making use of the *press* for the pur-
 pose of overthrowing the “ *illustrious House
 of Brunswick*.” Of the existence of any
 such conspiracy he had no proof; it was
 out of his power to state a single circum-
 stance in corroboration of such a charge;
 there was scarcely the possibility of be-
 lieving such a charge to be true. But, if
 you could suppose it possible, that he him-
 self believed the charge to be true at the
 time when he made it, what can you think

of him for having, to the last, suffered the charge to remain unretracted? He saw the proofs that Mr. Wardle brought forward; he heard all that we heard upon the subject; but never, during the whole of the proceedings, did he, in any shape whatever, retract his charges against the press, the cramping of which, even at that time, seems to have been resolved upon, and in the performance of which service he seems, for reasons best known to himself, to have taken the lead. It was seen, by those most deeply interested, that, unless the liberty of the press was destroyed, they would never be safe. The cry of *Jacobinism* was, therefore, revived. Mr. ROBERT WHARTON published a dirty pamphlet about Jacobinism, and he has been since made a *Secretary of the Treasury*. This attempt to frighten, to scare, to terrify, did, however, fail: the nation was not, a second time, to be frightened out of its senses; and, the Inquiry relative to the conduct of the Duke; the disclosure of all the scandalous transactions brought to light by that Inquiry, confirmed the nation in its disbelief of the preachers of alarm.

I beseech you, Gentlemen, to reflect a little upon the tendency of conduct such as I have here described to you. We are continually told of the necessity of *unanimity*, in order to enable us to resist our powerful enemy; but, how is it possible; I say possible, for us to be *unanimous*, while, upon every occasion, when we differ in opinion from such men as Mr. Yorke, or, rather when we make complaints, which he does not approve of, we are called *Jacobins, Conspirators, and enemies of the House of Brunswick*; that is to say, *traitors*; or, in other words, *men meriting the gallows*? Is this the way to make us unanimous? Is this the way to induce us to spend our "last shilling and shed the last drop of our blood" in opposing Buonaparté? We now complain, that this Gentleman has contrived to fasten himself upon us for life at the rate of 2,700*l.* a year, and, because we complain of such things, he calls us *Conspirators* against the House of Brunswick; and this, forsooth, is to induce us to be *unanimous* not only in defending the country against an invader, but in approving of all the measures of which this same Mr. Yorke chooses to approve. Verily, such men as Mr. Yorke must look upon us as a people superlatively base.

Before I come to Mr. Yorke's conduct,

during the present session of parliament, I must beg your attention to one particular passage in his Speech above-quoted. I allude to that, where he, upon the assumed ground of the charges of Mr. Wardle having arisen out of the existence of a *Jacobinical Conspiracy*, proposed the Inquiry to take place before a PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSION, and *not at the bar of the House*. This is well worthy of your notice. Upon that occasion, the person who had the confidence to propose a *close Inquiry*, was a person returned to parliament *by you*. It was *to you* that the nation owed an attempt, at that time, to cause the Inquiry to be kept from the bar of the House; because it was you, who sent Mr. Yorke to the House of Commons.

Exactly in the same spirit has he acted with regard to the present Inquiry. First, he both *speaks* and *votes* against Lord Porchester's motion for the Inquiry; and, unable to prevent its taking place, what does he next do, why enforces the Standing Order for the exclusion of Strangers, by which means he well knows, that the people will, in the first place, not get at what passes until some days later, and that the thing will thereby be rendered less interesting; next, that, though all the questions and answers will *finally* be published, yet that, coming out in such masses, the evidence will be read by comparatively few persons; and, thirdly, that the people will *never know by whom the several questions have been put*, nor see any account of the speeches made during the progress of the Inquiry, which, as we know from last year's experience, must be of the greatest importance in enabling us to judge of the conduct and views of the several members. In short, the shutting of the doors of the Gallery was doing all that it was possible for any man to do to keep from the people a knowledge of the facts relating to the Walcheren Expedition, and also a knowledge of the conduct of the members of parliament relative to the Inquiry into those facts. Besides himself there was but one man in the whole House (Mr. Windham), who openly justified the measure, of which it was impossible to mistake the motive. Even the ministers would not say, that they approved of the thing. It was to have the appearance of being the act of an *independent country gentleman*; the act of a *county member*; a man who had nothing at all to do with the ministers; but, who had, as it were by accident, taken it into his head, that it was right to shut the



gallery; and who could have no interest at all in the matter, not he! Gentlemen, if there were, amongst you, some persons, who viewed his conduct in this light, what must have been your surprize, what your shame and indignation, at seeing, in the course of a short fortnight, the minister come to the House and inform it, that this independent country gentleman, *this member for the county of Cambridge*, had accepted of a place under the Crown; had become even a *Sinecure Placeman*; had got a Crown grant upon the taxes; had fastened himself upon you as well as the rest of the people of England, for his whole life time, at the rate of 2,700*l.* a year?

Gentlemen, look here well into the conduct of this man. You know how heavy is the weight of your taxes. You know well how difficult it is for you to get together money wherewith to satisfy the almost daily demands of the tax-gatherer. The whole train of assessors, inspectors, supervisors, and surchargers of endless descriptions fail not to remind you of the burdens of taxation. Well, you hope, however, that what is thus raised upon you will be expended for none but *useful* purposes; or, at least you have a right to expect this; and you choose two persons, called your Representatives, to see, on your part, that the money raised upon you in taxes is expended only for useful purposes; but, what does one of these your representatives do? Why, *he takes 2,700*l.* a year of these taxes to himself*; he does nothing for this money; and he gets a grant from the Crown, which is to compel you, and the rest of us, to pay him out of the taxes, this 2,700*l.* a year as long as he lives; and, what is, if possible, still worse than all the rest, he has now the confidence, the assurance, the unparalleled effrontery, to appeal to you to judge of his conduct, and to call upon you to choose him again; that is to say, to give him another opportunity of making a pull at your purse.

Gentlemen, in his Address* to you,

* To the Gentlemen, Clergy, and Freeholders of the County of Cambridge.

GENTLEMEN,

His Majesty having been graciously pleased, without any solicitation or expectation whatever on my part, to appoint me one of the Tellers of his Exchequer, the trust, with which I have so repeatedly, and for so many years, been

upon this occasion, he talks about your "*liberal and candid good will*," which, if it mean any thing at all, certainly means something very different indeed from what is, upon all occasions, visible in *his* character. He trusts, that he has done nothing to offend you, "*because*;" . . . because, what? Why, because *his conscience* assures him, that he has *endeavour- ed* to discharge his duty towards you. What! was it, then, a part of his duty to take to himself 2,700*l.* a year of the money that you appointed him to watch over? Did he ask *you* to give him this salary for doing nothing? Did he ask *you*, whether he ought to accept of it? He tells you "that His Majesty has been gracious-
"pleased, without any solicitation or ex-
"pectation on his part, to appoint him
"one of the Tellers of his Exchequer." So, you are to believe, if you will, that the king *forced* the 2,700*l.* a year upon him; for, if you do not believe this, of what consequence is it to you, whether he *solicited* or *expected* the place, or whe-

honoured by you, has again devolved into your hands; my seat in parliament having thereupon become vacant.—I hope I may presume to throw myself once more upon your indulgence, and upon that liberal and candid good-will and support, which I have so often experienced. I trust that I have never done any thing that can justly deprive me of your good opinion, which is my chiefest pride; because my conscience assures me, that during the twenty years which I have spent in serving you, I have at least endeavoured, upon all occasions, to discharge my duty to you and my country with the utmost zeal, diligence, and fidelity.—I regret that the vacancy of my seat at this moment has prevented me from continuing to give my best assistance in forwarding and bringing to a conclusion several important Bills now depending in Parliament, for the security and improvement both of the County and Isle. Should it be your good pleasure again to elect me one of your Members, I shall apply my best diligence and industry in furthering and completing as well these, as all other measures that can contribute to the wealth and prosperity of both the districts of the county, and generally, to the advantage and happiness of the Empire at large.—I have the honour to be
Gentlemen, &c. C. YORKE

Charles-street, Feb. 28, 1810.

ther it came of itself. He *has* the place; he has taken care to have a grant for life of the 2,700*l.* a year; and, unless he can prove, that the king *compelled* him to have it, these miserable pretences do not at all mend the matter. There are, in most cases, two ways of expressing a thing, and, if Mr. Yorke had expressed himself in plain terms he would have begun his Address thus: "The king's minister has just got for me a grant of 2,700*l.* a year for life out of the taxes raised upon you and the rest of the nation, which you sent me to parliament to take care of; in return for which I am to do nothing at all, except to vote for the said minister." This would have been more plain in terms; but, the sense would have been the same; and, really, you must be made of no common mould, if you can read this supercilious Address without strong emotions of indignation. The latter part of it contains a sort of *threat*, that his re-election is necessary to the success of your *private bills* now before parliament. Gentlemen; believe not a word of this. Any member of the House can forward those bills as well as Mr. Yorke can. This is an appeal, not to good sense and public spirit; but, it is a direct appeal to ignorance and selfishness, of which he evidently pays you the compliment to suppose you abundantly stored.

The Address of Mr. BURRELL*; the

* To the Freeholders of the County of Cambridge.

GENTLEMEN; His Majesty's Ministers having thought fit to reward the services of Mr. Yorke, by granting to him for life, the very lucrative appointment of Teller of the Exchequer, his Seat in Parliament has become vacant; as on such occasions the Constitution has wisely declared, that Freeholders and Electors should decide on the propriety of such Grants, and on the political Merits of the Gentleman on whom they are conferred.—In the present Crisis, your decision involves so many important Considerations, that it must be looked to with eagerness and anxiety by all who have a just sense of the Situation of the Country.—In supporting Mr. Yorke, you support the men, who, by their councils, have sacrificed so many of our gallant countrymen, and exposed the nation to unparalleled failures in every part of Europe; who have uniformly resisted or evaded, those inquiries, which their conduct so imperiously demanded: but above

principles of which have been adopted by the opponent of Mr. Yorke, is good as far as it goes; and is excellent when compared to that of Mr. Yorke, who does not condescend to say, that he will ever move hand or foot in support of your rights and liberties. Indeed, considering the conduct of Mr. Yorke, it is almost impossible not to derive advantage from a *change*. It is not within the compass of probability, that you should make the matter worse; and, one very powerful argument in favour of the opposing candidate, is, that he is not a person at all likely, from any motive whatever, to seek after, or accept of, a *Sinecure Place*. But, the great thing for you to consider is, in my opinion, that, if you again choose Mr. Yorke, you will, in that act, identify yourselves with him as to all those principles, of which, for some time past, he has been the most hardy advocate. In his out-cry respecting a Jacobinical Conspiracy; in his setting his face against Inquiry; in all his attacks upon the Press; and finally, in his taking a *Sinecure Place* for life; in all those things, you, if you re-elect him, will become par-

all, you support the man, who, when the wisdom of Parliament had at length yielded to inquiry, was foremost in depriving the people of the melancholy consolation of hearing the progress of that interesting examination.—It becomes me, however, in presuming to solicit your suffrages, to explain the line of conduct which it is my intention to pursue.—I shall firmly co-operate with those who wish to reduce the lavish expenditure of public money. To the rights of the subject—to the independence of Parliament—to the vigilant exercise of its duties, I am sincerely and upon principle attached. The Liberty of the Press will always find in me a zealous supporter; and it will be my constant endeavour to promote, not to stifle, discussion of topics in which all Englishmen are, or ought to be, interested.—It only remains for me to say, that I shall take the earliest opportunity of presenting myself to the Freeholders, and of assuring them, that if they do me the honour of entrusting their interests to my charge, those interests will never be sacrificed, nor the private business of the County suspended, by my acceptance of a *Sinecure Office*, however lucrative, from any Administration.—I have the honour, &c. PETER ROBERT DRUMMOND BURRELL
Piccadilly, March 4, 1810.

ties; and, you will therein do an injury to your country as great as you have the power to do. Mr. Yorke has told you of his *twenty years* of parliamentary service. During that time he has always been a supporter of the ruling party, and has, for some years of the time, been a minister himself, or, at least, one of the ministry. Now, then, if you were to ask him *what had been done for you*, during that time, what could he answer? Your taxes have been increased four-fold in the twenty years; the National Debt has been increased in the same proportion; the Income and Assessed Taxes have been imposed during that time; upwards of twenty thousand Foreign Troops have been introduced and established here; and, during the same time, France, whom Englishmen used to speak of with contempt, has conquered almost the whole of the continent, of every nation of which, during this series of conquests, England has been the Ally. During almost the whole of Mr. Yorke's parliamentary career; during the twenty years that you have returned him to parliament, our government has been engaged in the *deliverance of Europe* from the ambitious encroachments of France; and, at the close of his career (for I trust it is over) the French have subdued the whole of Europe, a little speck or two in the Southern Peninsula excepted. His *length of service*, therefore, will hardly be an argument in his favour.

In cases of this sort, men are apt to be very forward with their tongues; but, unfortunately, there they stop. They complain of oppression: they complain of the burdens and the vexations they have to endure; each individual is, at all times, ready thus to *complain*; but, few, in general, are those, who are ready to exert themselves in the way of obtaining *redress*. To obtain redress, or to endeavour to obtain it, is the business of the whole community; and, therefore, it is, that but too many individuals are inclined to leave the work to their neighbours, who, on their part, are full as willing to leave the work to those individuals. Thus it is, that no redress is obtained; and thus are we compelled to bear burthen upon burthen even to the weighing of us down to the earth. If, indeed, you are satisfied; if you think it right, that your money should be taken from you to support *Sinecure Placemen*; why, then, you will act consistently in re-electing Mr. Yorke; but, then, remember, that all your future complaints about the

weight of taxes will be a fit subject for ridicule and scorn. Nor will this apply to those of you only who vote for him. It will apply, and with equal justice, to every man, who does not vote against him; nay, perhaps, the latter ought to be considered as the worst of the two.

Gentlemen, Mr. Yorke belongs to a set of persons, who have arrogated to themselves, exclusively, the name of "*the King's Friends*," thereby necessarily insinuating, that the king has *enemies* amongst his subjects. Nothing can well be more audacious than this. It is the custom of these persons to consider it as a matter of course, that all those who oppose them, are *enemies of the king*. Gentlemen, you have lately, I mean within these few years, seen a great many *peculators*, or *public robbers*, detected and exposed; and, I beg you to observe, and bear it in your mind, that all of them, without a single exception, have been distinguished for their professions of *loyalty*, and have called themselves "*king's friends*;" while, on the other hand, not one of those, who have, at any time, been denominated *Jacobins*, has ever been accused, or even suspected, of any act of *public robbery*. Here, therefore, is a complete answer to all Mr. Yorke's big talk about *loyalty*, which, it would seem, is possessed by no one, who does not, in one way or another, live upon the public. The gentleman, who is the declared opponent of Mr. Yorke, has a large fortune in your county, and has certainly every motive which a man can have for supporting the laws and constitution of England; yet, I venture to predict, that the partizans of this *Sinecure Placeman* will, by insinuation at least, accuse him of being a *Jacobin* and a *Leveller*.

The real friends of the king, Gentlemen, are those who endeavour to cause *truth to reach his ears*, and who have set *their faces against corruption and a consequent waste of the public money*; and these are precisely the persons, whom men like Mr. Yorke represent as the enemies of the king. It has been thus in all the countries that Buonaparté has subdued; and, it was thus in the old government of France itself. When the people have complained of their burdens, when they have besought a redress of their grievances, they have been answered by accusations of *disloyalty*, and, upon the ground of that charge, their grievances have been augmented by the very means employed

to prevent the necessity of yielding to their just and reasonable requests. The final consequence has generally been, that, when attacked, those countries have fallen an easy prey to the enemy. *We* have stood astonished spectators of that series of conquests. *Here* the conqueror was to be met; *there* he was to be beaten; *now*, and *then* again, his career was to be put an end to. Alas! we have *always* been disappointed: each succeeding hope has been destroyed almost as soon as conceived; till, at last, the contest is reduced to the simple point, whether England shall be subdued or not. In this state of things, who is the really *loyal* subject: the man, who is, and always has been, the supporter of every species of waste and corruption; or the man, who endeavours to put an end to that waste, and to root up that corruption?

Gentlemen, by those who are the most bold, or, rather, desperate, in supporting corruption, it has been broadly asserted, that *all the nation is corrupt*; that *the people* are more corrupt than those who have bought and sold seats in parliament; and that corruption *begins at the bottom* and is more inveterate there. Gentlemen, so false and foul a charge as this never was, in my opinion, before preferred. What! Because a man, by money, probably taken from the public purse, is able to corrupt some score or two of miserable wretches in a rotten borough, and thereby to procure his return to parliament; because, seats in parliament are obtained in this manner, are we to admit the truth of the accusation, that the whole of the people are corrupt; that corruption is as general as the air; and, that, therefore, there is no harm in corruption, or in any species of public robbery? The city of *Westminster* and the Borough of *Southwark* have proved that they, at least, merit not this accusation; and I do earnestly hope, that the county of Cambridge will follow their example, and, in so doing, set a noble example to other counties. There never was, perhaps, an occasion, when any body of electors had so fair an opportunity of distinguishing themselves as you have at this moment. The general principles of Mr. Yorke; his proved hostility to some of the dearest of our rights; his recent conduct, and his recent reward; his being compelled to appeal to the people, just enriched, as he is, with a sinecure, a thing, I believe, never before grasped at by a

county member, even in the most shameless of times: all these circumstances combined have naturally excited an uncommon degree of interest as to the ensuing election, and have fixed upon you the eyes of the whole nation: every one is waiting to know, whether the being a *Cambridgeshire man* shall, in future, be considered as a mark of honour or of shame. The case is so plain, that it admits not of dispute. It is not like ordinary cases, where men on both sides may claim credit for uprightness of intention. Here there can be no allowance for error of judgment. Your conduct must be right, or your intention must be wrong. The great, and, indeed, as I should hope, the only danger, will arise from *negligence*. Great is the majority of those Freeholders in every county, who may, if they will, act an independent part; but, then, they are apt to be backward to act *at all*, which is, in a case like the present, full as disgraceful as it is to act wrong. What remorse must that man feel, who, having had it in his power to save the honour of his county, and to do so great a service to his country, shall neglect to do it, through indolence or from any insignificant motives? Each man of you should feel upon this occasion, as if the salvation of your country depended upon his single efforts. Instead of each man saying, what can *I* do; each one should say, the whole depends upon *me*; if *I* am not there, *no one* will be there; it is upon *my* voice that the honour of my county and the good of my country rest. And, how little, alas! is the trouble or the cost of the requisite exertions! Which of you does not spend, every month in the year, more time and more money in mere amusements: in pursuits, which when compared to the one now contemplated, are too trifling to merit a thought? In the hope that each man of you will put this question seriously to himself, and in reserving some further observations for another Letter, I remain,

Gentlemen,

Your friend,

and obedient Servant,

W^m. COBBETT.

London, 8th March, 1810.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

LORD CHATHAM.—In page 281 of the present Volume, the famous Narrative of

Lord Chatham was inserted. On Friday and Monday last, a debate took place, in the House of Commons, upon a motion of Mr. WHITBREAD, the purport of which was, a censure on Lord Chatham for having laid the said Narrative before the king, and, upon which motion the ministers were left in Minority, there being for the motion 221 and against it 188.—Previous to this, there was another question carried against the ministers, the history of which was as follows.—Lord Chatham, after his Narrative was before the House, was questioned upon the point, whether he had not laid some *other paper* before the king, relative to the Expedition; but, upon this head his lordship *positively refused to give any answer*. Whereupon Mr. Whitbread moved an address to the king for the production of any such paper, if any such had been laid before him. The ministry *opposed this motion*; but, it was finally carried against them.—The answer from the king was, that he had no other paper of the kind from Lord Chatham; but, that, on the 15th of January, his lordship did lay before him this same Narrative. Let us, however, as the best, and even the shortest way, insert the king's answer.—“The Earl of Chatham having requested his Majesty to permit him to present his report to his Majesty, and having also requested that his Majesty would not communicate it for the present, his Majesty received it on the 15th of January last, and kept it till the 10th of this month, when, in consequence of a wish having been expressed by the Earl of Chatham, to correct the same, his Majesty returned it to him. The report, as altered, was again tendered to his Majesty, by the Earl of Chatham, on the 14th of this month, when his Majesty directed it to be delivered to his Secretary of State, and his Majesty has not kept any copy or minute of this Report, as delivered at either of those times, nor has he had at any time any other report, memorandum, narrative, or paper, submitted to him by the Earl of Chatham relating to the late expedition to the Scheldt.”—Upon this answer being given to the House the aforementioned debate took place; and, as was before stated, the motion of censure upon Lord Chatham was carried against the ministers, who made every effort to prevent the passing of such censure.—This debate, though it lasted two days, or, rather, nights, is by no means an interesting one.

It was so managed as to present us with the view of a mere battle for power; and, so much of the indirect object of it peeped out, that it lost much of the high character, which of right belonged to it.—The resolutions, proposed in Mr. Whitbread's original motion, were these:—“First, That John Earl of Chatham, having requested permission of his Majesty to present to him a narrative of his proceedings, did on the 15th of January, privately submit to the King a paper, bearing date the 15th of October, purporting to be a narrative of the proceedings of his Majesty's land forces under his command, of which he withheld all knowledge from his Majesty's Ministers, and the Admiral commanding the naval part of the Expedition, whose conduct he had implicated in no fewer than twelve parts of his narrative, and that on the 10th of February it had been returned, in consequence of a request from him to that effect, and that the same was again tendered on the 14th of February to his Majesty, having been altered, by the omission of a paragraph, containing an opinion, the substance of which, from the examination of Lord Chatham, they had not been able to ascertain.—Secondly, That it is the opinion of this House, that John, Earl of Chatham, having thus acted, had been guilty of an unconstitutional abuse of the privilege he enjoyed of having access to the throne, which could not but tend to be highly injurious to the public service.”—There was afterwards some modification of the words in *Italics*; but, that is not material.—The first Resolution is merely a statement of acknowledged facts, and, of course, calls for no observation. The second Resolution contains the censure; and, though there can be little doubt, that the conduct of Lord Chatham was censurable, this really does not appear to me to have been the best way of proceeding. I see nothing *unconstitutional* in any commander's presenting a Memorial, or a Narrative, any more than in any one's presenting a petition, to the king. Where is the law that forbids it? Where is the maxim, where is the principle, where is even the construction of law, that forbids such an act? The words *constitutional* and *unconstitutional* are extremely dangerous words; because they may be made to mean any thing that any man pleases to make them mean. They are, like Jack's will, “of Catholic utility.” When our

forefathers made the Revolution, and raised the present family to the throne of this kingdom, they never thought it of any great consequence whether a man should or should not go to the king with a paper of any sort; nor can I any where find, that they made such a clamour about *secret advisers*. This is a subject of complaint, that I can never understand. I do not see what mischief can arise from what is called *secret advice*. And, how is it possible to prevent the king from receiving such advice? If the advice breaks out into *acts*, then there is a ministry, responsible for what is done; for, if the king follows other peoples' advice, all that is in it, is, that the ministers ought to quit him. It has always been a favourite doctrine with the Whigs to consider the king as a mere man of wax. According to their doctrine, he is to have neither ears, nor eyes, nor tongue. Well, really, if this be so, why perform the empty ceremony of presenting Addresses and Petitions to him? Why complain, that the petitions of the people lie unopened at the office of the Secretary of State!—But, though I do not blame Lord Chatham for presenting a Narrative to the king, the manner of doing it I may and do blame. He wrote his narrative, he says, on the 15th of October; he presented it on the 14th of February; but, it now appears, that he did present it sooner, namely, on the 15th of January, a week before the parliament met. He is to blame for having enjoined *secrecy* on the king. Good God! what an idea! As if he had said, as, indeed, he did say in effect: "Here is my narrative, Sir; but don't you let any one see it for the present; that is to say, till I tell you."—This really is like dropping in to take a mutton chop with a man. However, if the king liked it, the point of ceremony was wholly between him and his General. But, then, this narrative did certainly contain very broad insinuations against Sir Richard Strachan; and that being the case, it was an *underhanded* act to present it without first apprising Sir Richard of its contents, or, at the very least, no promise of *secrecy* should have been asked of the king.—All this, however, is nothing when compared with the question which here arises between the *ministers* and the *country*.—This narrative of Lord Chatham contains most important information respecting both the *policy* and the *conducting* of the Walcheren Expedition. Observe; it was written on the 15th

of October. Do you believe, reader, that it lay quietly until the 15th of January, without being shewn to any of the ministers? Can you believe this? What was it drawn up for? The attacks upon Lord Chatham were going on daily in the news-papers. Is it likely, that he kept his defence in his pocket, 'till the 15th of January, without letting it see the light? Is it likely that he, who has no parliamentary interest, would set his colleagues at defiance by going to the king with his narrative before he shewed it to them? Nay, that he would request the king not to show it to them? Well; and supposing all this; supposing, that he really did thus keep the whole matter a secret from them till the moment when the paper was brought before the House of Commons; supposing this, do you believe, reader, that, in that case the ministers would have defended him, would have made such great exertions to save him from censure, and would even have risked a division which threatened to be so fatal to them? Is there in any sane mind credulity equal to a belief of this? I am convinced, that there is not a man in all England who believes it; and, indeed, it is almost an insult to the understanding of the public to have said so much upon the subject.—Well; now let it be remembered, that the ministry, the Walcheren ministry, the Jubilee ministry, advised the King, on the 20th of December, more than two months after the Narrative was written, to tell the city of London, in answer to their petition for Inquiry, that he did not intend to institute any Inquiry relative to the Walcheren Expedition. But, more especially let it be remembered; let it be borne in everlasting remembrance, that this Narrative of Lord Chatham was not amongst the papers laid before the House of Commons, in pursuance of the promise made in the SPEECH at the opening of the session. In that Speech the parliament were told, IN THE KING'S NAME, that he would cause to be laid before them such papers, relative to the Expedition, as, HE TRUSTED, would be satisfactory. Amongst the papers laid before the House of Commons, *previous to the Inquiry*, this Narrative of Lord Chatham was not, though it is now confessed that the king had it in his possession on the 15th of January, that is to say, eight days before the Speech was made to the Parliament, and that it remained in his possession until the first week in February;

[373] and, of course, it must have been in his possession, at the very moment, when a promise was made in his name, to lay before parliament such papers as he trusted would be satisfactory. At the time, indeed, when the other papers were laid before the House of Commons, it is said that this paper had returned for a few days, into the possession of its author; but why was not the House told, then, of the existence of such a paper? Why were they not apprized that such a paper was coming? The case is too plain to need another word: and, yet the ministers defend this Lord Chatham at the risk of their places! Would they have done this, if they, as now pretended, had been kept in ignorance as to the existence, or the purport of this paper?—Those who believe in Fairies would reject the belief of this.—I shall only add, upon this subject, that, from the Lists, printed in the news-papers, it appears, that SIR JOSEPH YORKE, the brother of MR. CHARLES YORKE, voted for Lord Chatham upon this occasion, or, at least, against Mr. Whitbread's motion of censure; and that LORD MAHON, the *Surveyor of Green War* and *Keeper of the Records in Birmingham Tower*, did the same.

REVERSION BILL.—This bill has, from some deficiency in point of *form*, failed again in the Lords; and another, it seems, is to be brought into the House of Commons. MR. PETER MOORE said, upon this subject being, the other day, before the House, that "this was a most unfortunate bill; it had had *many nurses* and was yet *stunted in its growth*; and notwithstanding all its friends, he was afraid it was not destined to come to maturity. He thought that the House ought not to abandon itself, and should pass Address upon Address rather than give up their opinions upon this measure.—He maintained, that the best service that could be done the Empire was to take care of the Finances. He adverted to the case of MR. STEELE, who had not been made an example of—so that other defaulters were encouraged. He then mentioned the cases of MR. VILLIERS and MR. HUNT, which had occurred since; and stated, that of the balance of 90,000*l.* due to the public, 30,000*l.* had been due from the year 1805, when MR. HUNT was Treasurer of the Ordnance before. *How many families must be called upon for taxes to make up these balances?* He thought the

"Bank might do for nothing the portion of the business of the public at present conducted by them, on account of the use of such an immense sum of public money, by which they were enabled to discount to the amount of from a million and a half to two millions a week. He then adverted to the little satisfaction the public had received with respect to the *Loyalty Men*, MR. JOHN BOWLES, &c. &c.; and concluded by declaring his preference of the mode of Address, as it kept the subject in their own hands."—This is the sort of Speech, to which MR. YORKE alluded, when he said, in answer to Sir Francis Burdett, that our greatest danger arose, not from Buonaparté (poor gentleman! as if he knew any thing about Buonaparté's views!): no, no; not from Buonaparté, but from *Speeches made in that House*, which gave a sanction to designing persons to circulate sentiments that "made us hate one another." Yes, if Mr. Yorke had been present, you, Mr. Moore, would certainly have incurred his *lofty* displeasure. What! would you, then, make us hate MR. STEELE, that old bosom companion of the minister who lent forty thousand pounds of the public money to Boyd and Benfield (then two members of parliament), without the sanction of parliament or the consent of his colleagues? Would you have us hate MR. VILLIERS, the *Right Honourable*, I believe, who, during a great part of this Jubilee reign, has been one of the most choice favourites at Court? "How many families," indeed! What are families, when compared to MR. Villiers and MR. Steele and MR. Hunt and our old friend John Bowles?—These are the Speeches, which, according to Mr. Yorke's notion, "make us hate one another;" make us hate such worthy people as those just mentioned. Very true, they do, in good earnest, tend to make us hate them; but, where is the harm of that, Mr. Yorke? Pray tell us, where the harm of that is. Pray tell us, why we should not hate them. But, above all things, thou sapient man, do tell us, how our hatred of such persons can tend to produce *public danger*. Do have the goodness to tell us, how it can possibly be, that our hating the Steeles and the Villiers's and the Hunts and the John Bowles's has a tendency to expose our country to danger. Or, if you are too busy to explain the mystery to the rest of us, do have the goodness to ex-

plain it to the Freeholders of Cambridge-shire.—The truth is, that this complaint was of a piece with all the rest of Mr. Yorke's conduct for some time past. It was intended to prevent, or check, the expression of wholesome truths in the House, and to prepare the way for the prevention of a repetition of them out of the House. This scheme, however, has hitherto failed, and, I trust, the people of Cambridge-shire will set upon it a mark of their reprobation.

Want of room compels me to postpone the observations, which I intended to have made upon the case of Mr. FULLER; upon the CITY OF LONDON PETITION against the pension to Baron Douro and Viscount Talavera (the town where our sick and wounded were left) and his two generations; upon the not hearing any thing lately about *the Rev. Mr. Beazeley*, who offered the Duke of Portland a bribe and who wrote a No-popery pamphlet; upon the subject of the Catholic Claims, and the dispute about the *Veto*; and, though last not least, upon the subject of the *Honourable WARWICK LAKE's* Court-martial, respecting the *putting of an English Seaman on shore upon a desert Island*, not forgetting the conduct of SIR ALEXANDER COCHRANE, and which subject must and will find its way to the heart of every man in this kingdom.

In consequence of a wish expressed by Mr. WRIGHT, the Editor of the PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, I think it right to state, that, in my observations upon the conduct of Mr. WINDHAM, at page 206 of this volume, where I say, that Mr. WINDHAM consulted with Mr. Wright as to the best place of standing in the House and the way to modulate his voice, it was not meant to convey the idea, that Mr. Windham was the *first mover* as to such consultation. The fact, as Mr. Wright says, was the contrary. He first mentioned the thing to Mr. Windham, in consequence of his being requested so to do by several of the Reporters, who expressed their regret that they could not hear him distinctly. But, the circumstance was not stated by me as containing matter of blame, any more than was the other circumstance of Mr. Windham's taking so much pains to have his *speeches printed and corrected*, to do which I myself had urged him many and many a time. Not in the way of blame were these things mentioned; but merely to show, that, at the bottom of his heart, he had not that con-

tempt for the persons, connected with the press, which his speech was calculated to make the world believe he had.

W^M. COBBETT.

London, 9th March, 1810.

COBBETT'S Parliamentary History OF ENGLAND,

Which in the compass of Sixteen Volumes, royal octavo, will contain a full and accurate Report of all the recorded Proceedings, and of all the Speeches in both Houses of Parliament, from the earliest times, to the Year 1803, when the publication of "Cobbett's Parliamentary Debates" commenced.

The numerous Subscribers to the above Work are respectfully informed, that the Sixth Volume, embracing the period from the Accession of Queen Anne, in 1702, to the Accession of King George the First, in 1714, will be ready for delivery on Saturday the 31st instant.

Trial of Mr. PERRY, and Mr. LAMBERT, for a LIBEL, continued from p. 352.

Gentlemen, I most perfectly acquiesce in the clear truth, propriety and necessity of the rule which his Lordship has laid down, as to the description of matter which I may desire to be read. If I were so far to forget the respect which I owe to the Court and to you, as to desire passages quite extraneous and foreign to the subject to be read, and attempt to create an argument from them, I should be properly rebuked by the Noble and Learned Lord. But I am not so bewildered. I know that nothing would be more absurd than to attempt to join things which have no connection. If we were charged, for instance, with the insertion of a paragraph offensive to morals, or with any crime the most intolerable and abhorrent to our natures, such as blasphemy or impiety, and that we were to bring a thousand paragraphs to prove our loyalty or our patriotism, they would not, and they ought not to stand up in any stead, for we can only adduce that which is pertinent to the matter in issue. But when I agree to this, I must lay in my claim, that the mere disjunction of paragraphs, which are kindred in tenor, and appropriate to the case, shall not not-

them, nor deprive me of their benefit; the Noble and Learned Lord will tell you that you have a right to take the whole paper into your view—That such has been the Noble and Learned Lord's own just practice, and recommendation to jurors, when he told them that the mind and intention of the Defendants were to be made out and ascertained from the whole tendency of the book or paper upon which the record was bottomed.

Now, Gentlemen, let me beg of you to attend to the immediate cause and reason of the appearance of the paragraph complained of in my Paper of the day mentioned. There is, as I said before, a full, temperate, and faithful narrative of the offer of negotiation which had been made by Mr. Perceval and Lord Liverpool, to Lord Grenville and Lord Grey—and there is contained in that narrative a train of reasoning upon the terms of the overture that had been made, on the answers thereto, and on the result. Having prepared and digested this paper, and delivered it to Mr. Lambert for insertion in *The Morning Chronicle*, I met with this paragraph in a respectable and well-written Sunday Paper (*The Examiner*), and finding it to harmonize with the Essay I had prepared—I took it as a fit and appropriate postscript; a just corollary from the foregoing propositions, and I directed it to be copied accordingly. I do not come here, therefore, to prate about negligence, or oversight, or creeping in by accident—No, I took it with my eyes open, in the morning, with my senses fresh, and with the entire approbation of my judgment as to its innocence. The first passage in the narrative, Gentlemen, to which I would beg leave to draw his Lordship's attention and yours, is in the second column of the second page, and is as follows:—

"Lord Grenville arrived in town on Thursday last, the 28th, at night, and, it is understood, that on the 29th he communicated to Mr. Perceval that he could not, consistently with his principles, have any interview, or enter into any discussion with him, with a view to his forming an accession to the present Administration, as he considered their measures to be most objectionable in every respect, and he could never approve the principles of their formation. It is understood that when he said this, he begged to express his most invariable and profound sentiments of respect for his Majesty; that his conduct and principles he trusted had always been

calculated to heal, not to foment, the divisions of the empire, but that he could not view what was proposed as tending to that end."

This will serve to shew you what was the feeling of the mind of that great and superior Statesman, as to the character and tendency of the system to which he was invited to accede, and in which his declaration is distinctly stated, that his conduct and principles had always been calculated to heal, not to foment, the divisions of the Empire, "but that he could not view what was proposed as tending to that end." Upon this the narrative proceeds to reason, and the whole tendency, purport, and drift of the subsequent argument is to shew that by a different course of proceeding—namely, if the Noble Lords had been commanded to attend his Majesty in person, there would have been an *immediate* prospect of a change of system that would have tended "to heal, not to foment, the divisions of the Empire." And this is particularly expressed in the next passage, to which I beg leave to draw your notice—where it is said:

"If the question relates to prospective measures, whether of war, negotiation, commercial intercourse, or domestic economy. If in those great leading lines of Government the conduct is to be directly the reverse of that which has been pursued, who shall represent to the Sovereign the wisdom of the measures that are to be proposed, or the mischief of those that are to be abandoned? Are those whose aid are asked in the crisis and exigency of public affairs, to be shut out from this communication; and is it to be entrusted to those who have a direct interest to give the representation a false colour, and, independent of interest, have views of the question calculated to mislead their judgment?"

So much for my meaning, as to the change of system, meaning a total change of measures only, but that that total change would bring a crowd of blessings in its train "immediately and of course."

Ah! but the period was to be postponed—No blessings till after the demise of our Sovereign Lord the King—and the crime of the charge is, that I postponed this happy period until that day which we all trust may be so distant. Read the paragraph which introduces that which speaks of the King, and of the Heir Apparent, together with that paragraph itself—and then see, Gentlemen, what interpretation you will put upon my adopted paragraph. It is as follows:

"Awful as the crisis is, and arduous as the task would be, we may conclude from their principles and conduct (meaning the principles and conduct of Lord Grenville and Lord Grey) that they will be ready to devote themselves to the service of their King and Country. But they cannot, consistently with these principles, permit Lord Liverpool and Mr. Perceval to be the persons to communicate their thoughts and views—a rule of action which we conceive to be most correct; not dictated by any narrow-minded principles of exclusion, but resting upon those sound and well considered views of the constitution which ought to govern their conduct as statesmen in this most important and interesting matter.

"We ought to add to this statement, that his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales has, upon this most curious and interesting occasion, taken a line which must exalt his character and endear him to his country. The sentiments of his Royal Highness on the awful crisis of the empire, and of the character of the measures which have led to that crisis, are not unknown. He feels on the subject like every other enlightened man, but more strongly, perhaps, because he has a deeper interest than any other in its welfare: but, from some unfounded rumours respecting his interference in the arrangements which were in contemplation, the Prince has thought it his duty to express to his Majesty his firm and unalterable determination to preserve the same course of neutrality which he has maintained, and which, from every feeling of dutiful attachment to his Majesty's person, from his reverence of the virtues, and from his confidence in the wisdom and solicitude of his Royal Father for the happiness of his people, he is sensible ought to be the course that he should pursue. We have no doubt but that this assurance of the filial respect of the Heir Apparent, in not interposing his high influence in the forming of an administration, will be most acceptable to his Majesty."

I pause here, Gentlemen, and fairly put it to you, whether I might not safely leave my whole case, and that of my faithful friend, in your hands here, with this demonstration of my feelings, with this declaration of my opinion before you. Will any fair man say that I do not in this paragraph inculcate the duty of love and reverence for his Majesty, by stating, not merely my own ideas of his royal virtues,

of his wisdom, and paternal solicitude for the happiness of his people, but the opinion and feeling of the illustrious personage, the highest subject in his empire—the most interested next to himself in its welfare—and whose example of reverence and devotion was so well calculated to inspire confidence and attachment in every class of the community? Gentlemen, this paragraph, so expressing his Royal Highness's sense of his Majesty's paternal wisdom and solicitude, I declare this day, in the presence of God and my country, I wrote, and that it expresses my own sentiments as one of his Majesty's most humble subjects.

Is there any thing here that talks of postponing the blessings to another reign? No, directly the reverse. There is present consolation held out to the people in the assurance of his Majesty's wisdom and paternal solicitude, and there is the cheering prospect of their being perpetuated by the description of the virtues of the Heir Apparent. I feel that I am brought here improperly, and that, instead of being charged with this as an offence, I should have received the thanks of every good friend of the Monarchy for the sentiment I promulgated.

I confess my astonishment that we should be brought here upon such a charge. And I have endeavoured in vain to find a reasonable justification for the Law Officers of the Crown in this proceeding. I cannot bring myself to believe, that they acted on the hasty and intolerant animadversion that was made upon the text by a rival Journalist the next day—an animadversion that was more than ordinarily coarse and violent, but I cannot help thinking, that the comment of the *Morning Post* has been officiously read, so as to make the impression in some quarter from which this prosecution originates: and that it is not the well-considered result of an examination of the paper by the Learned Gentlemen themselves.

[Here the Attorney General interrupted Mr. Perry, and appealed to the Court. He said, that he had remained silent longer perhaps than he ought, and suffered the Defendant to wander from the point at issue; but now that he was drawing into observation persons not in the Cause, and not in Court, and even naming them, he must interfere, and say that he could not submit to the irregularity.

Lord ELLENBOROUGH said, that if Mr. Attorney General had seen reason to stop

Mr. Perry before, he might have done so. If he had himself seen any material cause for interference, he certainly should have felt it his duty to have done so—although when a Gentleman came into the Court to speak for himself, they must not be fastidious if he did not entirely regulate himself by the established forms of their proceeding. Mr. Perry certainly must abstain from personal allusions.

Mr. PERRY said, My Lord, I respectfully submit to the rules of Court, persuaded as I am that my ignorance of its forms will not be taken as a trespass; and that under your Lordship's protection I shall not be unnecessarily narrowed in my defence. I was only endeavouring to find a motive to account for the prosecution, and I am perfectly sensible that their motives can be no justification of my conduct, if wrong.*]

Mr. PERRY proceeded—Gentlemen, take the paragraph by itself, unconnected with the illustration which I have given, and see if it can be tortured into the meaning which is put upon it. It does not allege that the successor of our present Sovereign Lord is to be more popular, it states only that he has the finest opportunity of becoming nobly popular.

* The following is the passage alluded to:—

"Never, surely, was any thing more calculated to insult the good sense or horrify the pure and amiable nature of his Royal Highness, nor was ever any thing more calculated to call forth the indignation and execration of a loyal and admiring people, upon the wretch who is capable of broaching ideas so repugnant to the feelings of the illustrious Heir Apparent, and to the ardent wishes of every good and virtuous subject. To the indignation and execration of the British nation do we therefore consign this damning specimen of the abominable and infamous sentiments by which the base faction are impelled in their most unprincipled and diabolical pursuits."—*MORNING POST*, 3rd October, 1809.

The allusion was really made to the above article, in order to shew the Editor of that paper (who when out of political contest is a most friendly and obliging man,) and to shew Editors in general, how indiscreet it is to throw unprovoked odium upon one another. If the press would only be true to itself, it would be unsailable.

Can these words involve even the insinuation of disrespect to his Majesty's sacred person? May they not rather be fairly construed into a most courteous and loyal compliment? Have I not a right to say that the duration of his Majesty's happy reign, the Fiftieth Anniversary of which we are now celebrating as a Jubilee, has given the finest opportunity (of which the paragraph speaks) for the Heir Apparent to learn the means by which he may make himself nobly popular? Was there ever an Heir Apparent since the Revolution—since the establishment of the Monarchy—since the beginning of the world, that did possess such opportunities as his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales? Did ever Prince study the art of Government in such a school—or did ever Prince undergo such a probation, as the length of his Royal Father's reign, and the fearful events which have passed under his eye, have afforded to his Royal Highness? Nay, after all, what is this, but what happens every day in colloquial discourse when it is a common flattery? Gentlemen, if I had not determined to abstain from every thing that could have the air or tone, or emphasis of elocution—that could be thought to be an attempt to engage and to work upon your feelings,—I could here adduce the most beautiful and the most tender passages from ancient and from modern writers—from the pages of the historian and of the poet, to shew that in all times and by the most sublime allusions, it has been considered the most endearing sentiment to the heart of a parent, that his virtues and his glory were to survive, and even to be transcendent in his son. But I am not come here, Gentlemen, to attempt to stir the emotions, but simply to address the understanding—And I may surely say, without disparagement of the Parent, that the Son may be nobly popular by following the example he has set, by treading in his steps, by having become so intimately acquainted with the character, with the feelings and with the interests of the people he will in due course of time be called on to govern—and what I conceive to be also most favourable, that he will be of a mature age, to chuse the persons, of whose experience, ability and maxims of Government he has had such means of being so thoroughly acquainted, as to enable him to give to his own free choice of his Administration the confidence of his subjects.

But, Gentlemen, I am able, fortunately, to shew you, by that which must be present to all your recollection, that at the time of the publication of the paragraph in question, there was a great topic of public interest in universal discussion, the nature and meaning of which you will discover in the context to which I have drawn your regard. At that time Parliament was not sitting. Public agitation was at its height: The topic was in every mouth; and the *Morning Chronicle* was the field of discussion on one side, as rival Journals were on the other. It was perfectly understood what was meant by the allusion of Lord Grenville to the principles which would tend to heal, and not to foment the divisions of the Empire. And to shew you that at the time my reasoning on the subject was taken and construed to mean distinctly, that the blessings which would crowd upon us by a change of system, would arise *directly*, and not *remotely*, if the Noble Persons who had been applied to as fit and proper Ministers, to strengthen and uphold the then enfeebled, tottering and disorganized Cabinet, had had the opportunity presented to them of impressing on his Majesty's Royal mind the conviction with which they were themselves impressed, I have only to recall your memories to the discussions of the time, and to the declarations which were understood to come from authority. Nay, I can shew you, that the reasoning of this very paper was so understood by that authority, and so answered on the very day subsequent to my publication. I presume, my Lord, I may be permitted to read, as a part of my speech, a paragraph to this effect, in direct answer to my article, from a paper which was published the day after?

LORD ELLENBOROUGH said, that if it was a paper published after the appearance of the paragraph in question, it certainly could not avail the Defendants in shewing their mind or intention in the previous publication; and he informed Mr. Perry, that he could not draw any inference from any paper whatever, without putting it in and proving it regularly as evidence; in which case the Prosecutor would have the power to adduce evidence to rebut it if he should think fit.

MR. PERRY. I thank you, my Lord. Gentlemen of the Jury, I am grateful to

his Lordship for the information by which your time will be saved, and by which I feel that I shall be served, for the paragraph I was going to read, might have led me into a train of reasoning, which I am sensible, upon reflection, it will be discreet for me to avoid†. Gentlemen, it is only necessary for me now to say, that not only from the paper of the day, but from all that I ever published, I wish you to form your judgment of my intention on this one act. It is in my opinion, from the whole body and tenor of a volume, that its tendency is to be taken, and a journal, though the numbers are published successively, is of the same character. You must look to the style, drift, and spirit, with which it is written, and the doctrine which it strives to inculcate. Gentlemen, try us by this most faithful, but most piercing test. More than thirty-three years of my life have I been engaged either as the Editor or Proprietor of a Public Journal—more than twenty years has my faithful friend laboured by my side, and that we are both destined to persevere in the labour may be owing to the integrity we have practised in it.

(To be continued.)

† The paragraph which Mr. Perry proposed to read, appeared in a very long, ingenious, and candid answer (seemingly from authority) in *The Courier*, to the article in his Paper on the day before. The words were as follows:

"We had hoped indeed, that the known opinion of the King, the known opinions of the Country upon this question, and the manner in which Lord Grenville had been disavowed by the Roman Catholic Bishops in the part he took in their name in the last Session but one, might have induced a disposition, without any pledge or any assurance being given or required, to have formed a government with persons who are known to think, that at least during the King's life that question should be kept at rest."

It is also to be remembered, that in *The Morning Chronicle* of the 4th October, the insulated paragraph, now complained of, was declared, "to express only a fervent hope that the religious prejudices of the present reign might not be perpetual."